



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,480	10/07/2004	Masatoshi Iio	50340-174	7440
7590	08/23/2007			
McDermott Will & Emery 600 13th Street N W Washington, DC 20005-3096				EXAMINER BASICHAS, ALFRED
		ART UNIT 3749	PAPER NUMBER	
		MAIL DATE 08/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/510,480	IIO, MASATOSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alfred Basichas	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-18,20,25-27 and 29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-15,19,21-24 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 16-18,20,25-27 and 29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's new claims 12-29 correspond to previously presented claims 1-11 as follows:

- a. New claim 12 = old claim 1 and 2.
- b. New claim 13 = old claim 4.
- c. New claim 14 = old claim 5.
- d. New claim 15 = old claim 6.
- e. New claim 16 = old claim 7.
- f. New claim 17 = old claim 8.
- g. New claim 18 = old claim 9.
- h. New claim 19 = old claim 10.
- i. New claim 20 = old claim 11.
- j. New claim 21 = old claim 1 and 3.
- k. New claim 22 = old claim 4.
- l. New claim 23 = old claim 5.
- m. New claim 24 = old claim 6.
- n. New claim 25 = old claim 7.
- o. New claim 26 = old claim 8.

- p. New claim 27 = old claim 9.
- q. New claim 28 = old claim 10.
- r. New claim 29 = old claim 11.

2. Newly submitted claims 16-18, 20, 25-27, and 29 correspond to previously presented claims 7-9 and 11, and are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: See previous office action.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 16-18, 20, 25-27, and 29 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 21-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawasumi (EP1198020), which shows all of the claimed limitations.

21. A warm up device for a catalytic reactor for use with a fuel cell power plant which comprises a plurality of catalytic reactors 13,15 each of which contains a catalyst 51,52, and a gas passage 42 for connecting the catalytic reactors in series (see at least fig. 1), the warm up device comprising: a burner 11 for producing combustion gas by

Art Unit: 3749

burning fuel 19 in order to warm the catalysts upon start up (i.e. "start-up combustor") of the fuel cell power plant; and combustion gas supply passages for distributing the combustion gas individually to the catalytic reactors (see at least fig. 1) and, wherein an activation temperature of a catalyst contained in a catalytic reactor is different from an activation temperature of a catalyst contained in a different catalytic reactor (inherent as the temperature will gradually reduce due to heat loss).

22. The warm up device as defined in claim 1, wherein the warm up device further comprises a heat amount supply adjustment mechanism 90 for reducing differences among the reactors in relation to a timing at which the catalyst reaches an activation temperature.

23. The warm up device as defined in claim 4, wherein the heat amount supply adjustment mechanism comprises a valve which is capable of supplying air 31,32,33 to one of the combustion gas supply passages (see at least paragraph 0048).

24. The warm up device as defined in claim 5, wherein the warm up device further comprises a sensor 70,71,72 for detecting a catalyst temperature of a specific catalytic converter which is connected to the one of the combustion gas supply passages and a controller functioning to: calculate from the catalyst temperature detected prior to combustion gas distribution an amount of heat required to warm the catalyst to activation temperature, compare the heat amount with a preset design warm up heat amount, and control the valve such that air is supplied to the specific catalytic converter when the heat amount is smaller than the design warm up heat amount.

28. The warm up device as defined in claim 1, wherein the catalytic reactors comprise a reformer 13 for reforming fuel to produce reformat gas containing hydrogen and carbon monoxide, a shift converter for reducing by shift conversion the carbon monoxide concentration in the reformat gas which flows therein from the reformer through the gas passage, and a preferential oxidation reactor for reducing by a preferential oxidation reaction the carbon monoxide concentration in the reformat gas which flows therein from the shift converter through the gas passage, and the combustion gas supply passages comprise a combustion gas passage for distributing combustion gas to the reformer and a combustion gas passage for distributing combustion gas to the preferential oxidation reactor.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 12-15 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasumi (EP1198020) in view of Woods (6,033,793). Kawasumi discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations, including varied air-fuel ratios. Nevertheless, Kawasumi does not specifically recite lean ratios. Woods teaches fuel reforming system for a fuel cell system wherein a lean air-fuel ratio is preferred in order to ensure the elimination of all non-reacted fuel and generate additional thermal energy. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the lean air-fuel ratio taught by Woods into the invention disclosed by Kawasumi, so as to ensure the elimination of all non-reacted fuel and generate additional thermal energy.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicants' arguments with regard to the rejected claims, filed June 1, 2007, have been considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection and/or not deemed fully persuasive.

s. Applicant asserts that Aoyama is not available as prior art for being owned by the same person. Accordingly, in view of applicant's new evidence the rejection based on Aoyama has been withdrawn. Nevertheless, the corresponding claims have been rejected using Woods.

Art Unit: 3749

- t. Applicant has noted that Kawasumi has a later date than the priority date of the instant application. Nevertheless, Kawasumi has an earlier filing date.
- u. Applicant asserts that the Examiner has no basis for asserting that the activation temperature of distinct catalysts being different would be inherent. The examiner disagrees and asserts that, while very small, there would indeed be a difference as the materials and distribution thereof within the catalysts would differ minutely and therefore cause a minute difference in activation temperature.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 571 272 4871. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center telephone number is 571 272 3700.

August 20, 2007



Alfred Basichas  
Primary Examiner